```
1
 2
                       UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 3
                      CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 4
                            WESTERN DIVISION
 5
 6
    UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
 7
 8
              PLAINTIFF,
 9
               V.
                                        21-MJ-03395
10
                                        LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA
11
    MATTHEW NICHOLAS GRIMES,
                                       JULY 20, 2021
12
                                        (3:22 P.M. TO 3:49 P.M.)
13
             DEFENDANT.
14
15
                     INITIAL APPEARANCE/DETENTION HEARING
                   BEFORE THE HONORABLE PATRICIA DONAHUE
16
                       UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
17
    APPEARANCES:
                              SEE NEXT PAGE
18
19
    COURT REPORTER: RECORDED; COURTSMART
20
    COURTROOM DEPUTY: ISABEL MARTINEZ
21
                              DOROTHY BABYKIN
    TRANSCRIBER:
                              COURTHOUSE SERVICES
22
                              1218 VALEBROOK PLACE
                              GLENDORA, CALIFORNIA 91740
                              (626) 963-0566
23
24
25
    PROCEEDINGS RECORDED BY ELECTRONIC SOUND RECORDING;
     TRANSCRIPT PRODUCED BY TRANSCRIPTION SERVICE.
```

2 1 APPEARANCES: 2 FOR THE PLAINTIFF UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: 3 TRACY WILKISON, ACTING UNITED STATES ATTORNEY BRANDON FOX 4 CHIEF, CRIMINAL DIVISION 5 ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEY BY: MACK JENKINS 6 ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEY 312 NORTH SPRING STREET 7 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012 8 UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 9 BY: NATHAN REILLY ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEY 10 27IA CADMAN PLAZA EAST BROOKLYN, NEW YORK 11201 11 (VIRTUALLY) 12 FOR THE DEFENDANT MATTHEW NICHOLAS GRIMES: 13 THE FREEDMAN FIRM 14 BY: MICHAEL GREGORY FREEDMAN ATTORNEY AT LAW 15 800 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD SUITE 1050 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90017 16 17 MICHAEL SCHWARTZ ATTORNEY AT LAW BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER 18 19 JOHN CESARO ATTORNEY AT LAW 20 BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER 21 22 23 24

4 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA; JULY 20, 2021; 3:22 P.M. 1 2 THE CLERK: CALLING CASE NUMBER 21-MJ-3395, UNITED STATES VERSUS MATTHEW NICHOLAS GRIMES. 3 4 COUNSEL, PLEASE STATE YOUR APPEARANCES STARTING WITH 5 PLAINTIFF. MR. JENKINS: GOOD AFTERNOON, YOUR HONOR. 6 7 MACK JENKINS ON BEHALF OF THE UNITED STATES. 8 AND IS THE COURT OKAY IF I REMOVE MY MASK FOR 9 PURPOSES OF ARGUMENT? 10 THE COURT: YES, THAT'S FINE. MR. JENKINS: THANK YOU. 11 12 MR. REILLY: YOUR HONOR -- I'M SORRY, YOUR HONOR. ALSO PRESENT FROM THE U.S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE IN 13 14 BROOKLYN IS NATHAN REILLY. THE COURT: I'M SORRY, COUNSEL. I DIDN'T QUITE HEAR 15 16 THAT. 17 NATHAN REILLY YOU SAID? 18 MR. REILLY: YES, YOUR HONOR. R-E-I-L-Y. THE COURT: GOOD AFTERNOON, MR. REILLY. 19 MR. FREEDMAN: GOOD AFTERNOON, YOUR HONOR. 20 21 MR. REILLY: GOOD AFTERNOON, YOUR HONOR. 22 MR. FREEDMAN: MICHAEL FREEDMAN APPEARING FOR THE 23 DEFENDANT MATTHEW GRIMES. 24 HE'S ALSO BEING REPRESENTED BY JOHN CESARO AND

MATTHEW SCHWARTZ OF BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER.

5 THE COURT: GOOD AFTERNOON, MR. FREEDMAN. 1 2 AND MR. GRIMES IS APPEARING BY VIDEO CONFERENCE. IS THAT CORRECT? 3 4 MR. FREEDMAN: YES, HE IS, YOUR HONOR. 5 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 6 GOOD AFTERNOON, MR. GRIMES. 7 CAN YOU HEAR ME? THE DEFENDANT: HELLO, YOUR HONOR. YES, I CAN HEAR 8 9 YOU. THANK YOU. 10 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. IF AT ANY POINT DURING THIS 11 PROCEEDINGS YOU CANNOT HEAR WHAT I AM SAYING, PLEASE SPEAK UP 12 RIGHT AWAY. 13 OKAY? THE DEFENDANT: YES, YOUR HONOR. 14 15 THANK YOU. 16 THE COURT: WE ARE HERE FOR AN INITIAL APPEARANCE ON 17 AN INDICTMENT -- (MIC OFF.) 18 IS MATTHEW GRIMES YOUR TRUE AND CORRECT NAME? 19 THE DEFENDANT: YES, YOUR HONOR. 20 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. AND, MR. GRIMES, DID YOU -- DID YOU AGREE TO APPEAR 21 BEFORE THE COURT BY VIDEO CONFERENCE TODAY AND TO GIVE UP YOUR 23 RIGHT TO BE PRESENT IN THE COURTROOM? 24 THE DEFENDANT: YES, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: DID YOU DISCUSS WITH YOUR ATTORNEY YOUR

RIGHT TO BE PRESENT IN COURT AND YOUR DECISION TO GIVE UP THAT 1 2 RIGHT? THE DEFENDANT: YES, YOUR HONOR. 3 THE COURT: DID YOU AUTHORIZE YOUR ATTORNEY MR. 4 5 FREEDMAN TO SIGN ON YOUR BEHALF THE FORM CONSENTING TO APPEAR 6 BY VIDEO CONFERENCE? 7 THE DEFENDANT: YES, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 8 9 AND MR. FREEDMAN, DID YOU DISCUSS WITH YOUR CLIENT 10 HIS RIGHT TO APPEAR IN COURT IN PERSON AND HIS DECISION TO GIVE 11 UP THAT RIGHT? AND DID HE AUTHORIZE YOU TO SIGN THE FORM 12 CONSENT ON HIS BEHALF? MR. FREEDMAN: YES, YOUR HONOR. 13 14 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THE COURT ACCEPTS THE CONSENT TO VIDEO CONFERENCE AND 15 ORDERS THAT IT BE FILED. 16 17 THE COURT HAS ALSO RECEIVED MR. GRIMES' FORM ADVISEMENT OF DEFENDANT'S STATUTORY AND CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS. THIS FORM STATES THAT YOUR RIGHTS HAVE BEEN EXPLAINED TO YOU 19 20 AND THAT YOU UNDERSTAND THEM. 21 DID MR. FREEDMAN READ AND EXPLAIN TO YOU YOUR RIGHTS 22 IN THIS CASE? 23 THE DEFENDANT: YES, YOUR HONOR. 24 THE COURT: AND DID YOU AUTHORIZE HIM TO SIGN ON YOUR BEHALF THIS FORM, ADVISEMENT OF DEFENDANT'S RIGHTS?

7 THE DEFENDANT: YES, YOUR HONOR. 1 2 THE COURT: DO YOU UNDERSTAND YOUR RIGHTS? THE DEFENDANT: YES, YOUR HONOR. 3 4 THE COURT: WOULD YOU LIKE TO HAVE THEM READ FOR YOU 5 AGAIN HERE IN COURT? 6 THE DEFENDANT: I UNDERSTAND MY RIGHTS, YOUR HONOR. 7 THANK YOU FOR OFFERING. 8 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 9 AND, MR. FREEDMAN, DID YOU READ AND EXPLAIN TO YOUR CLIENT HIS RIGHTS IN THIS CASE? 10 11 MR. FREEDMAN: YES, YOUR HONOR. 12 THE COURT: AND ARE YOU SATISFIED THAT HE UNDERSTANDS HIS RIGHTS? 13 14 MR. FREEDMAN: I AM. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 15 16 THE COURT ACCEPTS THE ADVISEMENT OF RIGHTS AND ORDERS 17 THAT IT BE FILED. 18 MR. GRIMES, AS I STATED EARLIER, YOU ARE CHARGED IN AN INDICTMENT THAT WAS RETURNED IN THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW 19 20 YORK. 21 HAVE YOU RECEIVED A COPY OF THIS INDICTMENT? 22 THE DEFENDANT: MY LAWYER SHOWED ME A COPY OF THE 23 INDICTMENT, YOUR HONOR. 24 THE CUORT: ALL RIGHT.

AND DID YOUR LAWYER READ THE INDICTMENT TO YOU?

8 THE DEFENDANT: YES, YOUR HONOR. 1 2 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. AND WOULD YOU LIKE TO HAVE THE INDICTMENT READ OR 3 SUMMARIZED FOR YOU HERE IN COURT? 4 5 THE DEFENDANT: NO, YOUR HONOR. THANK YOU. 6 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 7 AND I'M NOT ASKING YOU TO ADMIT OR DENY THE TRUTH OF 8 ANY OF THE CHARGES IN THE INDICTMENT, BUT I AM ASKING YOU THIS. 9 DO YOU UNDERSTAND WHAT IT IS THAT THE GOVERNMENT 10 CLAIMS THAT YOU DID? 11 THE DEFENDANT: YES, I UNDERSTAND, YOUR HONOR. 12 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THIS IS A CRIMINAL CASE. THE "DUE PROCESS 13 14 PROTECTIONS ACT" APPLIES. IT STATES AS FOLLOWS: 15 "IN ALL CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS THE PROSECUTOR IS 16 ORDERED TO COMPLY WITH THE DISCOVERY OBLIGATIONS 17 UNDER BRADY V. MARYLAND AND ITS PROGENY AND IS 18 REMINDED OF THE POSSIBLE CONSEQUENCES OF NOT DOING SO, INCLUDING EXCLUSION OF EVIDENCE, ADVERSE JURY 19 20 INSTRUCTIONS, DISMISSAL OF CHARGES, CONTEMPT, 21 REFERRAL TO A DISCIPLINARY AUTHORITY AND SANCTIONS." 22 AND THE COURT ORDERS THE GOVERNMENT TO COMPLY WITH 23 THE "DUE PROCESS PROTECTIONS ACT" IN THIS CASE. 24 THIS CASE IS AN OUT-OF-DISTRICT CASE. 25 THE COURT HAS RECEIVED A FORM "WAIVER OF RIGHTS IN

OUT-OF-DISTRICT CASES." 1 2 MR. GRIMES, DID YOU DISCUSS WITH YOUR ATTORNEY YOUR 3 RIGHT TO HAVE AN IDENTITY HEARING AND YOUR RIGHT TO THE ARRIVAL 4 OF PROCESS AND YOUR DECISION TO GIVE UP THOSE RIGHTS? 5 THE DEFENDANT: YES, YOUR HONOR. 6 THE COURT: AND DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT -- WHAT AN 7 IDENTITY HEARING IS IS ESSENTIALLY IT WOULD REQUIRE THE 8 GOVERNMENT TO PROVE THAT YOU ARE THE PERSON WHO IS CHARGED IN 9 THE INDICTMENT THAT WAS RETURNED IN NEW YORK. 10 DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? 11 THE DEFENDANT: YES, YOUR HONOR. 12 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. AND YOU'RE GIVING UP THAT RIGHT? 13 14 THE DEFENDANT: YES, YOUR HONOR. 15 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 16 AND, MR. FREEDMAN, ARE YOU SATISFIED THAT YOUR CLIENT 17 UNDERSTANDS THESE RIGHTS, AND THAT HIS WAIVER OF THEM IS KNOWING AND VOLUNTARY? 18 19 MR. FREEDMAN: YES, YOUR HONOR. 20 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 21 THE COURT ACCEPTS THE WAIVER OF RIGHTS IN 22 OUT-OF-DISTRICT CASES. 23 I'M SIGNING IT AND ORDERING THAT IT BE FILED. 24 ALL RIGHT. 25 I HAVE RECEIVED AND REVIEWED THE INDICTMENT IN THIS

CASE, ALSO, THE GOVERNMENT'S NOTICE OF REQUEST FOR DETENTION 1 2 INCLUDING THE EXHIBIT WITH INFORMATION PROVIDED BY THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE IN THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK. 3 AND I'VE ALSO REVIEWED THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION 4 5 OF THE PRETRIAL SERVICES AGENCY. 6 IS THE GOVERNMENT PREPARED TO PROCEED WITH A 7 DETENTION HEARING TODAY? 8 MR. JENKINS: YES, YOUR HONOR. 9 THE COURT: IS THE DEFENSE PREPARED TO GO FORWARD 10 TODAY? 11 MR. FREEDMAN: YES, YOUR HONOR. 12 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. DOES THE GOVERNMENT HAVE ANYTHING TO PROFFER IN 13 14 ADDITION TO THE ITEMS THAT I ALREADY MENTIONED? 15 MR. JENKINS: NO, YOUR HONOR. EXCEPT TO ADD THAT 16 VIRTUALLY APPEARING AS HE NOTED IS THE LEAD PROSECUTOR FROM THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK, MR. NATHAN REILLY. 17 SO, WHILE I WILL ARGUE IF THE COURT HAS SPECIFIC 18 QUESTIONS, I'LL JUST APPRISE THE COURT THAT MR. REILLY WILL BE 19 20 PREPARED TO ANSWER THEM IF THE COURT SO WISHES. 21 THE COURT: OKAY. THANK YOU. 22 ALL RIGHT. 23 THEN, THE GOVERNMENT MAY PROCEED. 24 MR. JENKINS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. 25 IN SUPPORT OF THE GOVERNMENT'S REQUEST FOR DETENTION,

THE GOVERNMENT PROFFERS THE INDICTMENT, THE PRETRIAL SERVICES REPORT, BUT NOT ITS CURRENT RECOMMENDATION, AND AS NOTED, THE NOTICE OF REQUEST FOR DETENTION AND EXHIBIT A.

IN SUPPORT OF THE REQUEST FOR DETENTION, AS THE EXHIBIT A POINTED OUT, WE DO BELIEVE AT SOME POINT THIS IS A BONDABLE CASE. JUST AT PRESENT THE CURRENT OFFERED TERMS, ALTHOUGH GETTING CLOSER, ARE NOT YET SUFFICIENT TO SATISFY THE GOVERNMENT'S INTEREST IN INSURING THE DEFENDANT'S APPEARANCE.

SO, MR. FREEDMAN AND MYSELF AND MR. FREEDMAN AND MR. REILLY HAVE BEEN ENGAGED IN THOSE DISCUSSIONS.

AND I WILL LET MR. FREEDMAN ARTICULATE HIS CURRENT POSITION. BUT HE IS AWARE THAT AT THIS POINT THE GOVERNMENT FEELS IT IS INSUFFICIENT. AND I'M PREPARED TO ARGUE.

BUT ON THE HIGHLIGHT LEVEL IS THIS, DEFENDANT, MR.

GRIMES, HIS -- THE CRIMES CHARGED -- 951 IS A VERY INFREQUENTLY

USED STATUTE. IT IS ACTING AS A GOVERNMENT AGENT FOR A FOREIGN

GOVERNMENT. THAT IS SIGNIFICANT TO A BOND ARGUMENT BECAUSE IN

THE FEW CASES THAT THIS AUSA HAS SEEN, THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN

THE FOREIGN GOVERNMENT AND OUR GOVERNMENT ARE OFTEN AT LOWER

LEVELS -- MEANING IT'S AN ASSISTANT REACHING OUT TO A

CONSULTANT, WHICH MAKES IT LESS PERNICIOUS BUT STILL ILLEGAL.

HERE, THE GOVERNMENT WOULD EMPHASIZE THAT IT WOULD BE HIGHEST LEVELS OF THE U.S. GOVERNMENT THAT THIS DEFENDANT WAS HELPING HIS CODEFENDANT REACH OUT TO AN INFLUENCE ON BEHALF OF THE UAE AT ITS HIGHEST LEVELS.

SO, WE ARE TALKING ABOUT THE HIGHEST LEVELS FROM UAE

TO THE HIGHEST LEVELS OF THE UNITED STATES AND BEING PAID -
BEING -- OPERATING ON BEHALF OF THAT GOVERNMENT, WHILE NOT ONLY

NOT DISCLOSING IT, BUT ACTIVELY CONCEALING IT.

SO, HERE THE QUESTION BEING WHETHER THIS DEFENDANT REPRESENTS A FLIGHT RISK. THE FACT THAT A HIGH-LEVEL FOREIGN GOVERNMENT ENTITY WOULD BENEFIT BY THIS DEFENDANT'S FLIGHT ALONG WITH HIS CODEFENDANT ESCALATES THE CONCERN ON THE GOVERNMENT'S BEHALF.

AGAIN, THERE ARE APPROPRIATE CONDITIONS, BUT WE WOULD ASK THAT THEY BE STRINGENT CONDITIONS, BOTH TEMPORALLY AND GEOGRAPHICALLY AS WELL AS FINANCIALLY, TO INSURE THAT THIS DEFENDANT DOES NOT EVADE JUSTICE.

AND THE LAST POINT I WILL HIGHLIGHT ON THAT -- (AUDIO SKIPPING.) -- AS NOTED IN THE LETTER THIS IS NOT A HYPOTHETICAL CONCERN. THE LEAD DEFENDANT IN THIS CASE WAS INTERVIEWED BY THE FBI IN 2018 RELATED TO THE CONDUCT THAT MR. GRIMES AND HIS CODEFENDANT ARE CHARGED FOR NOW. THREE DAYS AFTER THAT INTERVIEW THAT TOOK PLACE IN LOS ANGELES THAT DEFENDANT, THE LEAD DEFENDANT, FLED THE UNITED STATES AND HAS NOT RETURNED SINCE.

SO, AGAIN, THE GOVERNMENT WOULD ARGUE THAT HIGHLIGHTS
THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE CHARGES HERE, THAT AN INDIVIDUAL LIKE
THAT WOULD FLEE IMMEDIATELY. AND I THINK THAT AGAIN BUTTRESSES
THE GOVERNMENT'S CONCERN ON FLIGHT HERE, YOUR HONOR.

13 1 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 2 AND JUST SO I'M CLEAR, THE DEFENSE HAS PROPOSED A BOND WHICH THE GOVERNMENT CURRENTLY DEEMS INSUFFICIENT TO 3 4 ADDRESS THE RISK OF FLIGHT. 5 IS THAT RIGHT? 6 MR. JENKINS: YES. 7 AND REALLY BRIEFLY, PART OF THE CONCERN IS THAT THE 8 GOVERNMENT WOULD NEED TIME TO EVALUATE AND VET THE PROPOSED 9 SURETIES. SO, THERE'S BOTH THE SORT OF QUANTITATIVE ASPECT, 10 WHICH THE GOVERNMENT BELIEVES IS INSUFFICIENT, AND THERE'S ALSO THE QUALITATIVE ASPECT OF THE UNDERLYING SOURCES WHICH THE 11 12 GOVERNMENT WILL NEED TIME TO EVALUATE. 13 THE COURT: OKAY. 14 MR. JENKINS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU. 15 16 ALL RIGHT. MR. FREEDMAN. 17 MR. FREEDMAN: YES, YOUR HONOR. 18 I'M GOING TO FOCUS MY ARGUMENTS ON THE CONDITIONS. BUT JUST TO BRIEFLY DISCUSS THE FLIGHT RISK FIRST. 19 20 AS MR. JENKINS MENTIONED, THERE'S TWO OTHER 21 DEFENDANTS WHO ARE INCLUDED IN THE INDICTMENT. AND AT LEAST 22 UPON MY FIRST REVIEW OF THE INDICTMENT WITH MY CLIENT, HE IS A 23 FAIRLY LOW-LEVEL INDIVIDUAL IN ALL OF THIS, NOT TO DOWNPLAY THE 24 SERIOUSNESS OF THE CHARGES. BUT HE'S A YOUNG MAN. HE'S 27

YEARS OLD. HE HAS NO CRIMINAL HISTORY. HE NO LONGER WORKS AT

THE COMPANY.

WHATEVER ACCESS HE IS ALLEGED TO HAVE ONCE HAD TO THE COMPANY OR ITS RESOURCES IS NOW DONE.

AND THERE'S AN ALLEGATION OF THE COMPANY HAVING A PLANE, WHICH, FIRST OF ALL, HE DOESN'T HAVE ACCESS TO ANYMORE.

AND AS I UNDERSTAND IT, THE COMPANY DOESN'T EVEN HAVE.

HE -- WITH RESPECT TO FLIGHT RISK AS WELL, THIS
DEFENDANT, MY CLIENT, HAS BEEN AWARE OF THE FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS
LEADING TO THIS CASE TODAY FOR A NUMBER OF YEARS.

SO, AS IN MANY CASES, HE'S KNOWN THAT THERE WAS RISK.

AND IF HE WAS A FLIGHT RISK -- AS MR. JENKINS NOTED, ONE OF THE

DEFENDANTS IN THIS CASE DID IN FACT FLEE. MY CLIENT DID NOT

FLEE.

SO, THE FLIGHT RISK HAS ALREADY BEEN PROVEN TO BE MINIMAL AS TO THIS DEFENDANT.

NOW, WE'VE BEEN ENGAGED WITH THE GOVERNMENT BOTH HERE AND IN NEW YORK ALL DAY. AND ESSENTIALLY WHAT IT BOILS DOWN TO IS WE DON'T HAVE ANY OPPOSITION TO A SECURED BOND.

BASED ON MY EXPERIENCE, AT LEAST RECENTLY, ESPECIALLY WITH THE PANDEMIC, THE AMOUNT OF TIME THAT'S GOING TO BE REQUIRED FOR A SECURED BOND TO BE RECORDED WITH THE COUNTY AND POSTED COULD BE 30 TO 60 DAYS.

SO, I THINK WORKING BACKWARDS FROM EVENTUALLY HAVING

A SECURED PROPERTY -- WE'LL HAVE A PROPERTY TO PROPOSE TO THE

GOVERNMENT LATER TODAY OR TOMORROW. WE HAVE THE DEFENDANT'S

FATHER OWNS A HOME IN SANTA BARBARA THAT I BELIEVE HAS

SUFFICIENT EQUITY TO SATISFY THE GOVERNMENT. HE'S ALREADY

GETTING THE DEED AND THE MORTGAGE TODAY. WE CAN GET IT

APPRAISED BY TOMORROW.

I DON'T -- I DON'T THINK THE ISSUE IS REALLY GOING TO BE THE NUMBER OF THE AMOUNT OF EQUITY THAT'S DEEDED OVER. I THINK IT'S GOING TO BE THE GOVERNMENT JUST ASSURING ITSELF THAT THAT PROPERTY IS SUFFICIENT FOR ITS CONCERNS AS WELL AS THE FAMILY WHO'S PUTTING IT UP.

ONCE THAT'S ESSENTIALLY AGREED UPON, WE'RE STILL

GOING TO BE SEEKING TO HAVE THE DEFENDANT RELEASED ON EITHER A

SIGNATURE BOND OR SOME SORT OF PLACE HOLDER BOND. AND THAT'S

WHERE THE PRETRIAL SERVICES (AUDIO INTERRUPTION) AT THIS POINT

I THINK HAS IT RIGHT RECOMMENDING A 2-MILLION-DOLLAR COLLATERAL

BOND IN CASH OR SOME OTHER SECURITIES.

SO, WE THOUGHT ABOUT WHETHER IT WOULD MAKE SENSE TO PUT THIS OVER FOR A FEW DAYS TO GET TIME TO ASSUAGE THE GOVERNMENT'S CONCERNS AS TO THE PROPERTY. BUT I THINK IT'S RIPE FOR THE COURT TO ORDER BOND AT THIS POINT IN TIME, RECOGNIZING, OF COURSE, THAT IF IT'S A SECURED PROPERTY IN THE AMOUNT OF \$2 MILLION, WHICH IS THE SAME AS THE COLLATERAL BOND, THE GOVERNMENT IS STILL GOING TO HAVE TO APPROVE OF THAT BEFORE IT'S PROPOSED TO THE COURT. AND, SO, WE'RE NOT TRYING TO SHIRK THAT PROCESS.

AS MR. JENKINS SAID, WE'VE -- WE'VE MORE OR LESS SORT

OF GOTTEN TO A FRAMEWORK. I'M JUST SUGGESTING THAT IT'S

APPROPRIATE, ESPECIALLY IN LIGHT OF THE MINIMAL FLIGHT RISK

FACTORS THAT I'VE IDENTIFIED, TO IMPOSE THAT AS A BOND ORDER

NOW SO THAT WE CAN BEGIN WORKING TOWARDS THAT SPECIFIC TARGET.

IF IT'S GOING TO BE SECURED, THAT'S FINE. AND WE'LL BEGIN WORKING TOWARDS IT. AND WE THINK IN THE MEANTIME THERE SHOULD BE A PLACE HOLDER BOND. IF IT'S IN THE SAME AMOUNT OF \$2 MILLION, THAT'S FINE.

AND WE ALSO HAVE NUMEROUS INDIVIDUALS, INCLUDING THE DEFENDANT'S BROTHER, WHO'S IN TEXAS WHO ARE WILLING TO SIGN A SIGNATURE BOND IMMEDIATELY.

SO, WE -- WE DO THINK WE'LL GET THERE JUST AS MR.

JENKINS SAID. AND WE BELIEVE IT'S APPROPRIATE TO ENTER THAT

ORDER CONSISTENT WITH THE PRETRIAL REPORT AT THIS TIME.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

SO, MR. FREEDMAN, JUST SO I UNDERSTAND.

THE DEFENSE PROPOSAL IS THAT THE COURT SET BAIL AS

RECOMMENDED BY PRETRIAL SERVICES, WHICH IS THE COLLATERAL BOND

IN THE AMOUNT OF \$2 MILLION ALONG WITH A NUMBER OF RELEASE

CONDITIONS?

MR. FREEDMAN: CORRECT.

THE COURT: AND, THEN, YOUR PROPOSAL IS THAT THIS
BOND IS -- I THINK YOU SAID A PLACE HOLDER BOND -- THAT THE
DEFENSE IS PROPOSING WOULD BE REPLACED BY A DIFFERENT BOND
SUPPORTED WITH SECURITY AT A LATER DATE.

1 MR. FREEDMAN: YES. 2 AND JUST TO CLARIFY. 3 I THINK THE PRETRIAL RECOMMENDATION IS SUFFICIENT, JUST THE 2-MILLION-DOLLARS COLLATERAL BOND. BUT I RECOGNIZE 4 5 THAT THE GOVERNMENT IS FIRM ON WANTING PROPERTY. 6 AND, SO, IF -- IF THE GOVERNMENT HAS CONVINCED THE 7 COURT OF THE NEED FOR THAT, THEN, WE WOULD SUGGEST THAT IT BE IN THE SAME AMOUNT THAT PRETRIAL IS RECOMMENDING AS CASH. 8 9 AND, FURTHER, WITH RESPECT TO THE OTHER CONDITIONS I 10 FORGOT TO NOTE, I HAVE THE DEFENDANT'S PASSPORT NOW. THE FBI AGENT GAVE IT TO ME THIS MORNING. SO, HE'S -- HE DOESN'T HAVE 11 12 HIS PASSPORT. 13 THE OTHER CONDITIONS THAT WOULD BE NECESSARY TO 14 ADDRESS FLIGHT CONCERNS HE'S FINE WITH AS WELL. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 15 16 MR. JENKINS, WHAT IS THE GOVERNMENT'S -- I'M NOT 17 OUITE CLEAR. WHAT IS THE GOVERNMENT'S CURRENT POSITION WITH 18 REGARD TO THE -- I GUESS, WHAT IS IT THAT THE GOVERNMENT IS ASKING? -- JUST DETENTION PENDING A BOND ON TERMS DIFFERENT 19 20 FROM WHAT PRETRIAL SERVICES IS PROPOSING? OR IS THE GOVERNMENT 21 AMENABLE TO THE TERMS RECOMMENDED BY PRETRIAL SERVICES? 22 MR. JENKINS: YES AND NO. 23 YES, WE ARE REQUESTING DETENTION ON THE CURRENT 24 RECORD. WE DO NOT BELIEVE THE PRETRIAL SERVICES'

RECOMMENDATION IS SUFFICIENT. WE BELIEVE MR. FREEDMAN'S

PROPOSAL IS GETTING CLOSER, ALTHOUGH NOT YET THERE.

IN ADDITION, I WILL NOTE, IF WHEN WE GET TO THAT, WE WOULD ALSO REQUEST ADDITIONAL TERMS THAT PROBATION DID NOT RECOMMEND; FOR EXAMPLE, GPS IF AND WHEN WE GET THERE.

I WILL -- IF THE COURT WOULD LIKE TO HEAR FROM MR.

REILLY ON THE SPECIFICS IN TERMS OF A NUMBER -- FOR EXAMPLE,

MR. FREEDMAN'S PRESENTATION PROPOSAL MAKES SENSE, BUT THERE ARE

SOME QUESTIONS. FOR EXAMPLE, WHETHER THE \$2 MILLION IS

SUFFICIENT. AND WE DON'T HAVE ENOUGH INFORMATION ON IS THAT

ACCOUNT -- DOES IT HAVE \$2 MILLION, WHETHER THERE'S \$200

MILLION IN IT SUCH THAT THE \$2 MILLION IS LESS OF A CONCERN.

THE COURT: UH-HUH.

MR. JENKINS: OR IS IT THE FULL AMOUNT.

IN ADDITION, IF THE DEFENDANT IS RELEASED, AND THE PROPERTY, THE SORT OF BACK-UP PLAN TO REPLACE HIS PROPERTY PLAN, DOES NOT COME THROUGH, IS HE REMANDED INTO CUSTODY. AND IF SO, WHEN.

AND, SO, THOSE ARE SOME OF THE QUESTIONS THAT I THINK STILL NEED TO BE ADDRESSED.

AND I -- I WAS SIGNALING TO THE COURT I THINK THEY

ARE ADDRESSABLE WITH MR. FREEDMAN HOPEFULLY -- AND, OF COURSE,

IT'S UP TO YOUR HONOR. BUT I WAS SIGNALING THAT I DO THINK

THIS IS NOT GOING TO BE AN INDETERMINATE DETENTION FOR THE

DEFENDANT.

THE COURT: UH-HMM.

19 MR. JENKINS: BUT WE STILL BELIEVE THAT IT'S 1 2 IMPORTANT FOR THE REASONS STATED. 3 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 4 AS I SAID, I HAVE REVIEWED THE INDICTMENT AND THE 5 GOVERNMENT'S REQUEST FOR NOTICE OF DETENTION AND THE REPORT AND 6 RECOMMENDATION OF PRETRIAL SERVICES. 7 AND I DO FIND THAT THE DEFENDANT PRESENTS A VERY 8 SERIOUS RISK OF FLIGHT. AND I AM INCLINED TO ORDER DETENTION 9 BASED ON RISK OF FLIGHT. 10 I BELIEVE THAT THE TERMS RECOMMENDED BY PRETRIAL 11 SERVICES ARE INSUFFICIENT TO ADDRESS -- TO MITIGATE THE FLIGHT 12 RISK. HOWEVER, THERE MAY VERY WELL BE TERMS THAT WOULD --13 14 THAT WOULD ADDRESS THAT RISK OF FLIGHT. 15 AND I'M NOT SURE HOW THE TIMING PLAYS IN BECAUSE I 16 KNOW WE HAVE A WAIVER OF RIGHTS. SO, OBVIOUSLY, THE 17 DEFENDANT'S NEXT APPEARANCE IS GOING TO BE IN THE EASTERN 18 DISTRICT OF NEW YORK. BUT AT THIS POINT I AM INCLINED TO ORDER DETENTION 19 20 PENDING -- CERTAINLY WE'LL REVIEW A STIPULATION -- A STIPULATED 21 BOND SUBMITTED BY THE PARTIES. 22 AND I WOULD STRONGLY ENCOURAGE YOU BOTH TO DO SO. 23 MR. FREEDMAN: YOUR HONOR, WITH -- MAY I INQUIRE AS 24 TO THAT POINT?

25

THE COURT: YES.

MR. FREEDMAN: WE DO THINK THAT IT'S -- WE'RE

OPTIMISTIC THAT WE CAN TRY TO WORK SOMETHING OUT THIS WEEK.

AND IT WOULD OBVIOUSLY -- SAVES A TREMENDOUS BURDEN ON THE

DEFENDANT IF HE DOESN'T HAVE TO BE TRANSFERRED TO THE EASTERN

DISTRICT OF NEW YORK WHILE STILL IN CUSTODY.

ANY INSIGHT INTO THE TIMING WHEN HE WOULD BE TRANSFERRED UNDER THE COURT'S ORDER. IF IT WERE GOING TO BE EARLIER THAN THE END OF THIS WEEK, I GUESS WHAT I WOULD REQUEST TO DEAL WITH THAT IS IF WE COULD PUT A DATE ON CALENDAR BEFORE YOUR HONOR IN THE HOPES THAT WE WOULD REACH THAT STIPULATION BY THE END OF THE WEEK, EITHER THURSDAY OR FRIDAY. ESSENTIALLY CONTINUE THIS HEARING SO THAT THE (AUDIO INTERRUPTION) DETENTION AND TRANSFER TO NEW YORK DOESN'T TAKE EFFECT BEFORE THE END OF THIS WEEK.

THE COURT: CERTAINLY.

WHAT IS THE GOVERNMENT'S POSITION?

MR. JENKINS: OUR POSITION IS THAT I THINK THAT'S POSSIBLE, MEANING THAT THAT WOULD BUY THE DEFENDANT TIME IN SHORT.

WE WOULD JUST ECHO -- AND I'M NOW CITING THE COURT'S

VIEW -- THAT A LOT NEEDS TO GET DONE IN THOSE FEW DAYS.

SO, I DON'T KNOW IF IT MAKES SENSE TO SET IT FOR NEXT WEEK TO PROVIDE MR. FREEDMAN AND HIS CLIENT AND HIS FAMILY TO SATISFY WHAT THE GOVERNMENT HAS OUTLINED ARE OUR CONCERNS, AND AT LEAST ON THIS COURT'S RULING, THE COURT'S CONCERNS.

21 SO, WE CAN SET IT IN A -- IT'S UP TO THE COURT -- SET 1 2 IT IN A COUPLE OF DAYS. BUT I THINK THE BAR IS HIGH. AND, SO, I THINK TO SAVE EVERYONE TIME AND RESOURCES EITHER SETTING IT 3 NEXT WEEK WOULD GIVE THE DEFENDANT A BETTER CHANCE AT 4 SATISFYING AT LEAST THE GOVERNMENT'S CONCERNS. BUT THAT'S A --5 6 MR. REILLY: YOUR HONOR --7 (PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.) 8 MR. REILLY: -- WE DON'T OBJECT TO A SHORT -- I --9 WELL, GIVEN -- GIVEN THE NATURE --10 THE COURT: MR. REILLY, YOU'RE CUTTING IN AND OUT. 11 CAN YOU START OVER. 12 MR. REILLY: SURE. I APOLOGIZE, YOUR HONOR. WE DON'T OBJECT TO A CONTINUATION FOR A SHORT PERIOD 13 14 OF TIME. 15 I THINK THE GOVERNMENT'S CONCERN IS OBVIOUSLY A 16 SITUATION IN WHICH THE PARTIES ARE BETWIXT AND BETWEEN. BECAUSE, AS THE COURT IS AWARE, TRANSPORT AND CUSTODY 17 18 ITSELF CAN TAKE SOME TIME. AND WE WANT THE DEFENDANT --DEFENDANTS TO APPEAR TIME- -- IN SHORT ORDER HERE IN THE 19 20 EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK. 21 SO, IF THE COURT IS INCLINED TO A BRIEF CONTINUANCE 22 AS REQUESTED BY THE DEFENDANT, WE WOULD ASK THAT IT BE EITHER 23 AT THE END OF THIS WEEK OR MONDAY OR TUESDAY OF NEXT WEEK AT 24 THE LATEST BECAUSE WE DON'T -- WE DON'T WANT TO HOLD THIS

MATTER OPEN AND DELAY HIS APPEARANCE HERE IN NEW YORK.

THE COURT: MR. REILLY, DO YOU HAVE ANY INSIGHT ON HOW QUICKLY MR. GRIMES WOULD BE TRANSPORTED TO NEW YORK IN CUSTODY?

MR. REILLY: YOU KNOW, YOUR HONOR, I DON'T.

I CAN INQUIRE WITH THE MARSHALS. I -- I HAVE SEEN -I HAVE SEEN A TRANSPORT TAKE A MATTER OF DAYS AND AT OTHER
TIMES DEPENDING ON WHAT -- ON SORT OF WHAT THE BOP'S -- AND
EXCUSE ME -- AND THE MARSHALS' CAPABILITIES ARE IT CAN BE MORE
OF A MATTER OF, YOU KNOW, NORTH OF A WEEK.

BUT I CAN -- I CAN CERTAINLY COMMUNICATE WITH THE MARSHALS AND SEE IF I CAN GET A MORE PRECISE ESTIMATE. IT'S BEEN HARD TO NAIL DOWN IN MY EXPERIENCE.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THEN AT THE DEFENSE REQUEST,

I AM INCLINED TO PUT THIS MATTER OVER FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

REGARDING A POTENTIAL BOND UNTIL MONDAY, JULY 26TH.

AND I'LL LET MY COURTROOM DEPUTY DETERMINE THE TIME.

(PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.)

THE COURT: MY COURTROOM DEPUTY WILL TELL YOU THE AVAILABLE TIMES ON THE 26TH.

THE CLERK: IT WOULD HAVE TO BE 8:00 A.M., 10:00

A.M., NOON OR 2:00 P.M. BECAUSE HE IS HOUSED OR WILL BE HOUSED

AT SAN BERNARDINO.

MR. FREEDMAN: ANY OF THOSE TIMES IS FINE WITH THE DEFENSE, YOUR HONOR.

MR. JENKINS: THE SAME FOR THE GOVERNMENT, YOUR

1 HONOR. 2 (PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.) THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. WE'LL PUT THIS MATTER OVER 3 UNTIL JULY 26TH, 2021 AT 10:00 A.M. 4 5 THE COURT FINDS THAT THE DEFENDANT PRESENTS A SERIOUS RISK OF FLIGHT AND ORDERS THAT HE BE DETAINED PENDING THE 6 HEARING IN THIS COURT ON JULY 26TH OF 2021. 7 8 AND AS HE HAS WAIVED HIS RIGHTS, HE SHOULD BE 9 TRANSPORTED TO THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK. 10 AND IF IT TURNS OUT THAT HE CAN BE EXPEDITIOUSLY TRANSPORTED TO THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK BEFORE JULY 11 12 26TH, THEN, THE GOVERNMENT IS ORDERED TO NOTIFY THE COURT TO THAT EFFECT. AND I WOULD BE INCLINED TO LET HIM GET BACK TO 13 14 THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK AS QUICKLY AS POSSIBLE. AND I'M SURE THE COURT THERE WILL ENTERTAIN THE APPROPRIATE BOND TO 15 16 SET IN THIS CASE. MR. JENKINS: UNDERSTOOD, YOUR HONOR. 17 I WILL WORK WITH MR. REILLY TO LET THE COURT KNOW AT 18 THAT DIRECTION. 19 20 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU, COUNSEL. 21 MR. JENKINS: YES, YOUR HONOR. 22 THE COURT: IS THERE ANYTHING FURTHER FROM THE 23 DEFENSE? 24 MR. FREEDMAN: YOUR HONOR, IS THE MONDAY HEARING 25 GOING TO BE IN THIS COURTROOM OR IN YOUR HONOR'S COURTROOM?

```
24
 1
               THE COURT: THAT'S A GOOD QUESTION.
 2
               (PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.)
 3
               THE COURT: IT WILL BE IN MY COURTROOM ON THE 5TH
 4
     FLOOR OF THIS BUILDING.
 5
               MR. FREEDMAN: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
 6
               THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.
 7
               THANK YOU, COUNSEL.
 8
               MR. JENKINS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
 9
               (PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED 3:49 P.M.)
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

CERTIFICATE DISCLAIMER THE INTEGRITY OF THIS TRANSCRIPT MAY BE ADVERSELY AFFECTED DUE TO MICROPHONE PROBLEMS.) I CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING IS A CORRECT TRANSCRIPT TO THE BEST OF MY ABILITY FROM THE ELECTRONIC SOUND RECORDING OF THE PROCEEDINGS IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER. /S/ DOROTHY BABYKIN 7/27/21 FEDERALLY CERTIFIED TRANSCRIBER DATED DOROTHY BABYKIN